

## AF-9 - Promote Urban and Community Trees

### Benefit/Cost of Reducing CO<sub>2</sub>e:

Colorado: less than 0.1 MMt; less than \$5-50/ton<sup>11</sup>

Oregon: 0.1 MMt; 0.1% of 2025 emissions; Not cost effective over action's lifetime

**Assessment: High Priority. Bin A. 21 out of 22 votes.**

There are opportunities for carbon uptake here. Other benefits are cooling and reducing the need for air conditioning, thereby reducing the carbon associated with electricity production.

Urban and community tree programs are very popular with the public. Through the Tree City USA program, cities that enact ordinances and require spending on trees can receive federal funding. Other existing programs include Utah Community Forest Council, and the State's urban and community forestry program. The state allocated \$200,000 for urban forestry this year. A 37% reduction in next year's federal budget is anticipated so state money was very timely.

There is an ongoing need for people to have information about residential tree planting. An educational program would be useful.

Strategic planting of urban trees can have an energy conservation effect through shading and transpiration cooling of residential and commercial structures. This conservation effect can have a larger impact on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than the sequestration provided by urban trees and can be large enough to offset the emissions associated with fossil-fuel powered tree maintenance equipment. Importantly, urban tree-related energy conservation represents a permanent avoidance of the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions that would have been used to provide space conditioning for urban structures, while the sequestration benefits of urban and other trees are reversed when the trees ultimately decay.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Cost savings are possible if material from maintenance are directed towards product and energy use.

<sup>12</sup> Effects of Urban Tree Management and Species Selection on Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide, Nowak, Stevens, Sisinni, and Luely, Journal of Arboriculture 28(3): May 2002, 113.